

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hiroki Ishikawa et al. Group Art Unit: 1712
Serial Number: 10/511,659 Examiner: Peng, K.L.
Filed: November 17, 2004 Confirmation No.: 4271
Title: Thermoconductive Curable Liquid Polymer Composition And Semiconductor Device Produced With The Use Of This Composition

Attorney Docket No.: TSL 1789US

"MAKE OF RECORD" LETTER

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

The following errors have been found in the above-identified United States Letters Patent:

IN THE DRAWINGS:

With respect to Figure 1,

“P” should be deleted and replaced with --1--,

“Q” should be deleted and replaced with --2--,

“R” should be deleted and replaced with --3--,

“S” should be deleted and replaced with --4--,

“T” should be deleted and replaced with --5--, and

“U” should be deleted and replaced with --6-- so that the reference numerals in Figure 1 are commensurate with the reference numerals in the specification of the subject patent.

As the USPTO is aware, the subject patent is a national stage application of Patent Cooperation Treaty No. PCT/JP03/06798, which published with Figure 1 having reference numerals 1-6. When the national stage application was filed, Figure 1 was filed by having reference letters P-U, which correspond to reference numerals 1-6. This Figure was not rejected by the Examiner.

IN THE CLAIMS

In column 11, line 21, delete “1” and replace with --10—thereby making claim 9 depend from claim 10, as described additionally below.

Claims 8 and 9, as issued, are duplicative. In Applicant’s Amendment dated June 12, 2007, claims 28-33 were added, with claim 28 in independent form. Applicant also stated that “[n]ew claims 29-33 are identical to original claims 2 and 6-9, respectively, but dependent from new claim 28.” However, claim 33 included an inadvertant clerical error, which caused claimed 33 to depend from claim 1. The Examiner did not notice nor object to this clerical error at the time the Amendment was entered, nor did the Examiner notice or object to this clerical error at the time of issuance. Therefore, after allowance, this claim was moved by the USPTO to depend from claim 1, though this exact claim already existed, causing claims 8 and 9 to be duplicative. The dependency of claim 9 should be amended such that claim 9 is dependent from what is currently independent claim 10.

It is respectfully submitted that the foregoing corrections be made of record in the file of the subject patent.

Respectfully submitted,
HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC

Dated: January 15, 2009

/David M. LaPrairie/

David M. LaPrairie, Registration No. 46,295
450 W. Fourth Street
Royal Oak, Michigan 48067-2557
(248) 723-0442